

Safety and Aesthetics in Urban Roadway Design
Interdisciplinary Group Meeting
June 5, 2002, 9:00 to 3:30 p.m.
WSDOT Materials Lab Conference Room
Safety and Aesthetics Interdisciplinary Group Meeting

Meeting #4 of quarterly meetings:

The meeting opened with introductions, agenda agreement/discussion, and open forum for feedback on the Safety, Aesthetics, and Context-Sensitive Design Workshop. The following comments were stated:

- FHWA stated that they would like to have been more participative in the workshop
- Roadside Safety (Mark Maurer) handled the technical difficulties in the track chair and didn't get to see much of the other workshop presentations
- Presentations were diverse, holistic approach with emphasis on design
- 20 year plans – earlier involvement from communities and stakeholders
- Better understanding of context-sensitive design
- Alternatives & solutions – appropriate solutions
- The title of the workshop did not mention safety but safety was present everywhere
- Rethink name – name stands in the way, a roadblock
- The Tennessee presentation was an example of a 20 year stalemate and the contribution to the project being completed
- Feedback from other states expressed a desire and the inspiration to put the new ideas to use immediately
- *The legal session was particularly requested for a second time, opportunity for a mini-legal session. – Roadside Safety has a conference coming up in Ellensburg July 26th and 27th
- Opportunities missing, lively debates, and a surprise that the European countries use context sensitivity only in low speed environments
- Washington has a reputation for the most Plaintiff friendly state in the Union
- Judges need to be educated in the legal principles not necessarily the process

Presentation and introduction of the second brochure – preliminary copy – DRAFT.
Other points established:

- Barrier focuses
- Aesthetically pleasing, impact attenuator issue raised
- Share ideas of location to include for future picture inclusions
- Include the test level barriers have been test at
- Mention funding
- Feedback welcome but due by June 25th to Mark Maurer for review and inclusion in the next draft of the brochure and Mark to send out draft before next review

Research report (NCHRP) presented by Dick Albin – this report has been selected for funding and implementation. It is out for bid to contractors and will be a year out until work starts.

Value Engineering – should include the aesthetic treatment for safety reasons
Access control – barriers important to funding

Three steps on the Path to Resolution

Step One: Jurisdiction in Urban Areas

Topic of conversation was the RCW 4724 ambiguously stating the jurisdiction outside curbs. Open to interpretation and policy in carrying out the law. Outside curb will be city jurisdiction and not DOT driven. City limits population – threshold 22-5 is maintenance and signals not threshold driven. State highways and cities should reach a maintenance agreement. DOT will issue an Instructional Letter for implementation rather than write a revision for the *Design Manual*. Local Programs Engineer (Al King) will review the deviations outside the standards.

Step Two: Clear Zone

Topic covered the clear zone and who is responsible for guidance. A table is published in the *Design Manual* for guidance in jurisdiction used outside cities and the jurisdiction used within cities will maintain no guidance but is the responsibility of the cities. Evaluate with rural chart.

It was suggested not to limit to Rural. The responsibility is how it goes in incorporated cities and unincorporated cities DOT sets the standards.

It was also suggested that the law governing jurisdiction and clear zone can easily be interpreted five different ways by five different people. Is there a way to clarify that?

Step Three: Median Design Elements

Medians, two-way traffic, access control, and site distance are equally important in the use and design of median elements. Option Two: Shared responsibility (discussion and analysis of tradeoffs, results in a corridor analysis and exceptional design) was the most significant.

Julie Matlick presented her Community Partnership Forum Project information and book for comments and feedback. The biggest issue was the design standards. It was felt that the review process is costly and cumbersome. Focused on the process. Recommendations are on the back side of the green handout. Several points were directed to the flow chart on page 15 and the table of projects fallouts in design review and how they might occur. Comments are due by June 25th to meet this summer publication date.

Larry Messmer answered questions regarding utilities impacts. The RCW 4724 city responsible for decisions DOT does not have permitting authority. The speed limit of 35

mph and under was the defining criteria. In city areas regardless of speed it is the cities responsibility. Clear zone and control zone should be one in the same.

Nancy Boyd presented a conceptual example of design principles and design terms handout designed by Larry Hinson and pictures provided by Ted Focke. Went through the outline verbally and solicited feedback for the text-written materials to be embellished and developed by DOT experts. Consulting the “experts” will be the choice of preference in further development of the “tool” to be used for the layperson or informed person. The Community Partnership Forum project will be the process.

A suggestion to move mobility upfront due to the super critical implications. Under 3-c all the function of transportation should be addressed. Include freight and economic picture.

Truncated domes were discussed and the following issues were highlighted:

- ADA mandated
- For the visibility impaired
- Required on all non-standard ramps
- Must be addressed when any alternative is used in rebuilding the streets
- Serious implication for funding if not used

Guidance and development Group:

Darlene Sharar	Guidance development
Elizabeth Robbins	Guidance development
Susan Kempf	Community impacts
Mark Maurer	Landscape
Sally Anderson	Landscape
Troy Cowan	Useable document
Paul Harker	Safety
Larry Hinson	Pictures and expert text content
Ted Focke	Pictures and expert text content

Action Items:

Harold Peterfeso to contact TIB and ask about funding.
Feedback to Julie Matlick on the “Community Partnership Forum Project Book” due by June 25th.
Read the RCW 2724 proposed by Harold Peterfeso
Nancy Boyd:
to schedule next meeting sometime in early September
TIB follow-up
FHWA outcome of workshop

Elizabeth Robbins legal side of questions
Mark Maurer brochure comments

Attendees:

Mark Maurer	WSDOT
Sally Anderson	WSDOT
Dave Olson	WSDOT
John Milton	WSDOT
Jim Ellison	Pierce County
Dick Albin	WSDOT
Paul Harker	FHWA
Elizabeth Robbins	WSDOT
Troy Cowan	WSDOT
Harold Peterfeso	WSDOT
Chris Mudgett	CRAB
Jim Seitz	AWC
Mike Dornfeld	WSDOT
Susan Kempf	OTED
Ken Miller	City of Federal Way
Al King	WSDOT
Shane DeWald	Seattle Transportation
Nancy Boyd	WSDOT
Larry Messmer	WSDOT